

Plaintiff objects to question No. 29 on the grounds that it implies that sympathy is only a problem if shown to the Plaintiff. Because the law requires that sympathy not be shown to either side, Plaintiff asks that the question be modified from “for Mr. Harvey” to “for one or both of the parties,” so that the jury is not confused by the law.

Plaintiff objects to questions nos. 31 and 32 on the grounds that they seek have potential jurors prejudge the case before the evidence is presented. As worded, these questions encourage jurors to predetermine how they will rule.

Respectfully submitted this 2nd day of December 2022.

By: /s/ Jeffrey P. Yashinsky
Jeffrey P. Yashinsky, Esq.
Georgia Bar No. 780370
Kurt Kastorf, Esq.
Georgia Bar No. 315315
Attorneys for Plaintiff

295 West Crossville Road
Building 600, Suite 610
Roswell, GA 30075
(770) 691-8100
Jeff@yashinskylaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day electronically filed the foregoing
PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED VOIR DIRE BY THE
KROGER COMPANY with the United States District Court for the Northern
District of Georgia Atlanta Division by using the PACER Efiling system, and
opposing Counsel was served via STATUTORY ELECTRONIC SERVICE to:

Matthew G. Moffett
(mmoffett@grsmb.com)
Sarah Raquel L. Lisle
(slisle@grsmb.com)
Gray, Rust, St. Amand, Moffett & Brieske, LLP
950 East Paces Ferry Road
1700 Atlanta Plaza
Atlanta, GA 30326

This is to further certify that the foregoing complies with the font and point
selections approved by the Court in Local Rule 5.1. It is prepared in Times New
Roman 14-point font.

This 2nd day of December 2022.

295 West Crossville Road
Building 600, Suite 610
Roswell, GA 30075
(770) 691-8100
Jeff@yashinskylaw.com

By: /s/ Jeffery P. Yashinsky
Jeffrey P. Yashinsky, Esq.
Georgia Bar No. 780370
Attorney for Plaintiff